

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

JAN 09 2006

Patent
Old Attorney's Docket No. 040070-423
New Attorney's Docket No. 0119-018

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

| | | |
|-------------------------------|---|-------------------------|
| In re Patent Application of |) | |
| |) | |
| Roozbeh ATARIUS et al. |) | Group Art Unit: 2664 |
| |) | |
| Application No.: 09/678,907 |) | Examiner: MEW, Kevin D. |
| |) | |
| Filed: October 4, 2000 |) | Confirmation No.: 7241 |
| |) | |
| For: METHOD AND APPARATUS FOR |) | |
| AUTOMATIC FREQUENCY |) | |
| CONTROL IN A CDMA RECEIVER |) | |

RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION

Mail Stop AMENDMENT
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

The following remarks are submitted as a complete response to the Office Action mailed on September 9, 2005.

Claims 10-11, 15, 25-26, 30-58, 62, and 66-82 remain pending in the application. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

The allowance of claims 10-11, 25-26, 31-40, 41-58, 62, and 66-72 is again gratefully acknowledged.

Before addressing the substantive issues raised in the Action, it is noted that Office Action Summary page indicates that it is "Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 July 2005", but makes no mention of the Supplemental Amendment filed on August 5, 2005. In that Amendment, claims 62 and 66 were amended merely to correct an informality that was only then discovered in the claims. In particular claim 62 first defined "at least one summer", but then later referred to this element as "the combiner." Similarly, claim 66 first defined "performing at least one weighted summation," but then later referred to this as "the combining step." Therefore, these claims were amended to cure the noted inconsistencies. No new matter was added. Applicants assume that the failure of the Office Action Summary page to refer to the August 5, 2005 was an oversight. If this is not the case, it is requested